

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE		PAGE 1 OF 2		
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. AM-0001		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 12/11/01		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY CODE		US ARMY ENGINEER DISTRICT, HONOLULU CORPS OF ENGINEERS, BUILDING S-200 FORT SHAFTER, HAWAII 96858-5440 CONTRACT SPECIALIST: RENEE M. HICKS		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) CODE			
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)				(X)		9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.	
						× DACA83-02-R-0003 9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) <div style="text-align: right;">12/07/01</div>	
				()		10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
						10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE		FACILITY CODE					

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☒ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☐ is extended, ☐ is not extended.

Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:

(a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. Accounting and Appropriation Data (If required)

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

(X)	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.
	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc). SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
	D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ☐ is not, ☐ is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)
FY02 MCA PN 50846 COLD STORAGE FACILITY, AND FY01 RDT&E REPAIR WATER TANKS, U.S. ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL

(See Page 2 of 2 Pages)

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
<div style="border-top: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">(Signature of person authorized to sign)</div>		<div style="border-top: 1px solid black; text-align: center;">(Signature of Contracting Officer)</div>	

AM-0001
RFP No. DACA83-02-R-0003
Item 14 (Continued)

Standard Form 30
Page 2 of 2 Pages

1. CHANGES TO SPECIFICATIONS. Attached hereto are new and revised pages to the solicitation. The revision mark "(Am-0001)" is shown on each page.

a. NEW PAGES. The following pages are added to the specifications:

Section 00210 - Evaluation Factors for Award - pages 1-10

b. REVISED PAGES. The following pages are hereby revised:

Section 00010 - SF 1442

2. The proposal due date of March 1, 2002, 2:00 P.M. Hawaiian Standard Time (HST) remains unchanged.

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

I. GENERAL:

1.1 Cost of Preparing Proposals: The Government will not reimburse any Offeror its costs incurred in submitting an offer in response to this solicitation.

1.2 Inquires: Address all inquiries regarding this Request for Proposals to:

U.S. Army Engineer District, Honolulu
Attn: Ms. Renee Hicks (CEPOH-CT-C)
Building S-200
Fort Shafter, Hawaii 96858-5440
Phone No. (808) 438-8567
Fax No. (808) 438-8588
E-Mail: renee.hicks@usace.army.mil

1.3 Proposal submission and sequence of evaluation:

1.3.1 The Government will evaluate offers in accordance with the NON-PRICE EVALUATION FACTORS (the technical proposal) and the offeror's price, as set forth in this Provision.

1.3.2 During proposal evaluation, the NON-PRICE EVALUATION FACTORS will be evaluated by a Source Evaluation Board (SEB) utilizing an adjectival rating method described below.

1.3.2.1 Rating Method.

1.3.2.1.1 TECHNICAL MERIT. The following adjectival rating and description will be used to rate each non-price evaluation factor, except Past Performance :

1.3.2.1.1.1 Excellent: The proposal is outstanding; proposal demonstrates excellent understanding of requirements. Offeror's proposed capability or proposed effort is of the highest quality and thoroughly justified or substantiated. Total internal consistency and no incompatibility with other portions of proposed efforts. Proposal has significant strength(s) in meeting the Request for Proposal (RFP) requirements, which is not offset by a weakness(es).

1.3.2.1.1.2 Highly Acceptable: Proposal is good; proposal demonstrates good understanding of requirements. Offeror's proposed capability or proposed effort is high quality and well justified or substantiated. No or very minor inconsistencies or incompatibilities with other portions of proposed efforts. Proposal has a strength(s) in meeting the requirements of the RFP, which is not offset by a weakness(es) or has only minor weakness(es).

1.3.2.1.1.3 Acceptable: Proposal is acceptable; proposal demonstrates acceptable understanding of requirements. Offeror's proposed capability or proposed effort is of an acceptable level of quality and justified or substantiated. No significant inconsistencies or incompatibilities with other portions of proposed efforts. Proposal may have a strength(s) in meeting the requirements of the RFP and/or may have a weakness(es).

1.3.2.1.1.4 Marginal: Proposal is susceptible for improvement; proposal demonstrates shallow understanding of requirements. Insufficient evidence that offeror's proposed capability or proposed effort is of an acceptable level of quality. Inconsistencies and incompatibilities with other portions of the proposal exist. Proposal may have a strength(s) in meeting the requirements of the RFP; however, they are offset by either significant weakness(es), and deficiency(ies). Although a major rewrite is not required, substantial revisions are required to correct weakness(es) and deficiency(ies) to make the proposal acceptable.

1.3.2.1.1.5 Unacceptable: Proposal is unacceptable; Government's minimum requirements are not met and substantial effort would be required to meet the Government's minimum requirements. The Offeror's proposal lacks evidence of capability to perform proposed effort. Numerous major inconsistencies, weaknesses, and significant deficiency(ies). Proposal has minimal or no chance of success; correction would require extensive revision, a major rewrite, to be rated as acceptable.

1.3.2.1.2 PROPOSAL RISK. Each non-price evaluation factor, except Past Performance, will be evaluated for degree of risk and will be rated using the following ratings and descriptions:

1.3.2.1.2.1 LOW: Any proposal weaknesses have little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increase in cost, or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will probably minimize any difficulties.

1.3.2.1.2.2 MODERATE: Proposal has weaknesses that can potentially cause some disruption of schedule, increase in cost, or degradation of performance. However, special contractor emphasis will probably minimize difficulties.

1.3.2.1.2.3 HIGH: Proposal has weaknesses that have the potential to cause serious disruption of schedule, increase in cost, or degradation of performance even with special contractor emphasis.

1.3.2.1.3 PERFORMANCE RISK. Past performance will be rated using the following adjectival ratings and definitions:

1.3.2.1.3.1 Very Low Risk: Offeror's past performance record provides essentially no doubt that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

1.3.2.1.3.2 Low Risk: Offeror's past performance record provides little doubt that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

1.3.2.1.3.3 Moderate Risk: Offeror's past performance record provides some doubt that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

1.3.2.1.3.4 High Risk: Offeror's past performance record provides substantial doubt that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

1.3.2.1.3.5 Very High Risk: Offeror's past performance record provides extreme doubt that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

1.3.2.1.3.6 Neutral Risk: The offeror has no relevant performance record. The offeror has not provided past performance information and/or Government was unable to find any past performance information.

1.3.3 The Offeror's price proposal will not be scored, but will be evaluated, separately from the offeror's technical proposal. The Government shall compare the competing prices proposed by all the offerors, together with the Government's Estimate, to establish price reasonableness. Cost analysis will not likely be performed under this solicitation, however, the offerors' price breakdown will be evaluated.

1.3.4 Upon completion of separate evaluation of all technical and price proposals, the SEB will then evaluate each Offeror's technical and price proposal together, determining the relative strengths, deficiencies, significant weaknesses and risks that each total proposal presents to the Government. The Government will make award to the Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the government, considering both price and non-price factors. In its evaluation of all the offers, the Government will weight price and technical offers approximately equally, but may give greater consideration to technical factors when price offers tend to be equal and may give greater consideration to price when technical offers tend to be equal.

1.3.5 Upon completion of evaluation of all proposals and their ranking, the Contracting Officer will, in accordance with the provisions of this solicitation and applicable acquisition regulations, proceed to award without discussions. Offerors are advised that the Government intends to award without discussions. However, if discussions are determined to be necessary, the Contracting Officer will establish a competitive range and conduct discussions with those Offerors within the competitive range. Upon conclusion of discussions, if necessary, the Contracting Officer will request final proposal revisions from the Offerors remaining in the competitive range and may,

upon receipt of final proposal revisions, proceed to award a contract without further discussions or notice.

2. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS: Offeror shall provide an INDEX for each of the proposal volumes/sections that shows the title of the subject matter discussed therein and the page number where the information can be found. In particular, Offeror shall specifically reference the topics and evaluation factors addressed in this section of the instructions. Offeror shall tab and index the proposal to match the factors and subfactors. Proposals that are not tabbed and indexed may be considered non-responsive.

2.1 General Requirements for Proposals:

2.1.1 Submission requirements for proposals.

2.1.1.1 Technical Proposals:

Submit one (1) original proposal and four (4) copies, in the format for Technical Proposals as set forth in this Provision.

2.1.1.2 Price Proposals:

2.1.1.2.1 Complete and submit one (1) original and two (2) copies of Section 00010, the Price Proposal Schedule, which is found in this solicitation.

2.1.1.2.2 Submit one (1) original and one (1) copy of the Offeror's Price Breakdown in the format as set forth in Appendix B to Section 00600. Indicate on the Price Breakdown whether or not Facilities Capital Cost of Money is included in the contractor's costs of performing the work. Proposals that state that Facilities Capital Cost of Money is not included in the contractor's costs of performing the work—or proposals that don't state anything at all about Facilities Capital Cost of Money—will be deemed to have waived Facilities Capital Cost of Money. Additionally, submit one electronic copy of the Cost Breakdown, formatted in either Microsoft® Excel97® or Word for Windows97® or an earlier version of the same. Submit the electronic copy on a three and one-half inch (3½") floppy diskette, IBM compatible, labeled with the offeror's name, the solicitation number and title, and the words, "Cost Breakdown Electronic Copy."

2.1.1.2.3 Submit with the Price Proposal:

2.1.1.2.3.1 One (1) original and two (2) copies of the Offeror's completed Standard Form (SF) 1442, using a printed copy of the SF 1442 that has been issued under this solicitation;

2.1.1.2.3.2 One (1) copy (certified as a true copy) of the Offeror's executed joint venture agreement (if the Offeror is a joint venture);

2.1.1.2.3.3 One (1) copy of the Offeror's completed Section 00600, Representations and Certifications, using a printed copy of Section 00600 that has been issued under this solicitation; and

2.1.1.2.3.4 One (1) copy of the Offeror's completed (if applicable) SF LLL, Disclosure of Lobbying Activities, using a printed copy of the SF LLL which is found in Appendix A to Section 00600.

2.2 Format Requirements for Proposals:

2.2.1 Any information, presented with a proposal that an Offeror wants to have safeguarded from disclosure to other parties must be identified and labeled in accordance with the requirements of Provision "52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors—Competitive Acquisition (Feb 2000)," subparagraph (e), which is found in Section 00100 of this solicitation. The Government will endeavor to honor the restrictions against release requested by Offerors, to the extent permitted under United States law and regulations.

2.2.2 Prepare proposals in the English language.

2.2.3 Type or print all information presented in the proposal, to the extent possible. Use clear, simple English letters and numbers. Laser printer-quality printing is adequate for the proposals. Elaborate calligraphy is not desired. Do not use size printing or typing less than 10 pitch (United States). Use black characters on white paper as much as possible. Color should be used for clarity, not for purposes of decoration. Do not use colors that do not reproduce legibly using standard office or commercial facsimile or copying machines. Prepare technical proposals on standard (United States), letter-sized (8.5 x 11 inches) or substantially similar international/metric-sized pages. Use only one side of the page. Use non-glossy paper of good weight and quality. Expensive or elaborate paper stock is not desired.

2.2.4 Submit proposal packages to the US Army Corps of Engineers ("the Government") as shown in Block 8 of Standard Form 1442.

2.2.5 Proposals received by the Government after the date and time set for receipt of proposals will be handled in accordance with the requirements of Provision "52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors—Competitive Acquisition (Feb 2000)," subparagraph (c), found in Section 00100.

2.3 Specific Requirements for Technical Proposals:

2.3.1 Submit technical proposals in a narrative format, organized and titled so that each section of the proposal follows the order and format of the factors and subfactors set forth below in paragraph 4. "Technical Evaluation Factors and Submission Requirements."

2.3.2 Information presented in the technical proposal should be sufficiently detailed in order to clearly describe how the technical proposal addresses the technical proposal evaluation factors. Professional looking and well organized (as opposed to poorly prepared and haphazardly organized) proposals will likely be considered to reflect more favorably on the capabilities of the Offeror; however, it is not the Government's intent to require elaborate "magazine-style" proposals. It is not necessary, nor desired, that Offerors prepare elaborate or lengthy proposals.

2.3.3 There is no limit to the size of technical proposals, or the amount of information that may be submitted to the Government. However, information should be concisely presented, to the extent possible. Information presented should be organized so as to pertain to only the evaluation factor or subfactor in which section the information is presented. Information pertaining to more than one evaluation factor or subfactor should be repeated for each factor or subfactor.

2.3.4 The proposal must set forth full, accurate, and complete information as required by this solicitation. The Government will rely on such information in the award of a contract. By submission of an offer, the Offeror agrees that all items in its proposal (key managerial and technical home office and on-site personnel, subcontractors, targets for utilization of eligible SDB concerns, etc.) will be used throughout the duration of the contract and any substitutions of items will require prior approval by the Contracting Officer.

3. RELATIVE WEIGHTS OF TECHNICAL EVALUATION FACTORS

3.1 When the technical proposal is evaluated as a whole, Evaluation Factor (1) is greater in weight than Evaluation Factor (2) Evaluation Factor (3) and Evaluation Factor (4). Evaluation Factor (2) is greater in weight than Evaluation Factor (3). Evaluation Factor (3) is greater in weight than Evaluation Factor (4).

3.1.1 Evaluation Factor (1) - Past Performance/Experience. Subfactor (1)(a) is greater in weight than Subfactor (1)(b).

3.1.2 Evaluation Factor (2) - Personnel experience, qualifications and organization. Subfactor (2)(a) is greater in weight than Subfactor (2)(b).

4. TECHNICAL EVALUATION FACTORS AND SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

4.1 Evaluation Factor (1) - Past Performance/Experience in an overseas environment similar to USAKA.

4.1.1 Subfactor (1)(a) - Offeror's past performance history in completing projects of similar scope, dollar value, and complexity during the past 5 years.

4.1.1.1 Submission Requirements for Evaluation Subfactor (1)(a) - Provide the following for each applicable project

(including projects with the Federal, State, and Municipal Governments and private industry):

4.1.1.1.1 Contract Number, Project Description and Location,

4.1.1.1.2 Contracting Officer/Owner's Point of Contact, Telephone Number,

4.1.1.1.3 Original Contract Amount,

4.1.1.1.4 Final Contract Amount,

4.1.1.1.5 Final Completion Date (as established by contract modifications),

4.1.1.1.6 Actual Completion Date (date work accepted by Government or customer),

4.1.1.1.7 Estimated Percentage of Actual Construction Work that the Prime Contractor and its employees performed on the project,

4.1.1.1.8 Interim or Final Performance evaluation (if customer was the Federal Government, submit Standard Form 1420),

4.1.1.1.9. Letters of Appreciation/Commendation and Awards. Letters or other communications generated specifically for purposes of this solicitation may not be given as much weight as evaluations and other communications that are generated in the ordinary course of business.

4.1.1.1.10 Offerors that report an adverse or unfavorable interim or final performance evaluation should attach a narrative that explains, rebuts or describes lessons learned from the adverse or unfavorable evaluation.

4.1.1.1.11 If the Offeror proposes to subcontract part of the work, provide the same information as required above for Offeror's proposed subcontractors. This applies to any subcontractor which the offeror expects to perform more than 20 percent of the work under the contract, in terms of the relation of the subcontractor's price of doing the work compared to the offeror's overall cost of doing the work. Regardless of the percentage of the work they may undertake, the evaluation factor also applies to any electrical, mechanical, sheet metal roofing, structural steel, or masonry subcontractor.

4.1.1.1.12 For each completed project which the Offeror identifies as an example of past performance, describe the completed project's past performance relevance to the current, proposed project in terms of the Offeror's proposed use of the same key management personnel and subcontractors (including the proposed use of the same key personnel for subcontractors and the use of any same lower tier subcontractors).

4.1.1.2 The information provided by the Offeror will provide the major portion of the information used in the Government's evaluation for past performance. The Government may use other sources to assess past performance information such as the Construction Contractor Appraisal Support System (CCASS) and inquiries with previous customers/owners.

4.1.2 Subfactor (1)(b) - Offeror's experience in completing projects of similar scope, dollar value, and complexity in the past 5 years.

4.1.2.1 Submission Requirements for Evaluation
Subfactor (1)(b) -

4.1.2.1.1 Describe projects of similar scope, dollar value, and complexity, on-going or completed within the past 5 years.

4.1.2.1.2 State why or how the Offeror's experience with the described projects is relevant to the Offeror's expectation of successful completion of this project.

4.1.2.1.3 If the Offeror proposes to subcontract part of the work, provide the same information as required above for the proposed subcontractors. This applies to any subcontractor which the offeror expects to perform more than 20 percent of the work under the contract, in terms of the relation of the subcontractor's price of doing the work compared to the offeror's overall cost of doing the work. Regardless of the percentage of the work they may undertake, the evaluation factor also applies to any electrical, mechanical, sheet metal roofing, structural steel, or masonry subcontractor.

4.2 Evaluation Factor (2) - Personnel experience, qualifications and organization demonstrating experience in successfully executing U.S. Government projects in remote sites, similar to USAKA.

4.2.1 Subfactor (2)(a) - Experience and qualifications of the Offeror's proposed key managerial and technical home office and on-site personnel to be used for the project that demonstrate the Offeror's ability to provide quality work within the project completion period, for the price offered.

4.2.1.1 Submission Requirements for Evaluation
Subfactor (2)(a) -

4.2.1.1.1 Identify the key managerial and technical home office and on-site personnel who will be assigned to work under the contract.

4.2.1.1.2 For each person so identified, provide a resume or other information that describes his or her qualifications for the job(s) that the person will be performing, including any special skills or experiences deemed worthy of note.

4.2.1.1.3 Describe each person's familiarity with U.S. Government construction procedures, including Contractor

Quality Control (CQC) procedures, if applicable to the position the person is to hold within Offeror's organization.

4.2.1.1.4 For all named, proposed subcontractors in Offeror's proposal, provide the same information as required in the preceding paragraphs for the subcontractors' proposed key managerial and technical home office and on-site personnel. This applies to any subcontractor which the offeror expects to perform more than 20 percent of the work under the contract, in terms of the relation of the subcontractor's price of doing the work compared to the offeror's overall cost of doing the work. Regardless of the percentage of the work they may undertake, the evaluation factor also applies to any electrical, mechanical, sheet metal roofing, structural steel, or masonry subcontractor.

4.2.2 Subfactor (2)(b) - The Offeror's proposed home office and on-site organization structure to be used under the contract that demonstrates the Offeror's ability to provide quality work within the contract completion period, for the price offered.

4.2.2.1 Submission Requirements for Evaluation
Subfactor (2)(b) -

4.2.2.1.1 Describe the Offeror's proposed home office and job site organization.

4.2.2.1.2 Describe how the Offeror intends to monitor and control timeliness, quality and safety of the work at the job site, including the work of the subcontractors.

4.2.2.1.3 Incorporate into the description an organizational chart for home office and on-site managerial and technical staff, tying in the identities of the key managerial and technical personnel that are described in Subfactor (2)(a).

4.2.2.1.4. For all named, proposed subcontractors in Offeror's proposal, provide the same information as required in the preceding paragraphs for the subcontractors' proposed home office and on-site organization structure. This applies to any subcontractor which the offeror expects to perform more than 20 percent of the work under the contract, in terms of the relation of the subcontractor's price of doing the work compared to the offeror's overall cost of doing the work. Regardless of the percentage of the work they may undertake, the evaluation factor also applies to any electrical, mechanical, sheet metal roofing, structural steel, or masonry subcontractor.

4.4 Evaluation Factor (4) - Offeror's corporate resources and experience with logistics that demonstrates it will be able to successfully order, track and deliver materials and equipment in a timely manner to USAKA.

4.4.1 Submission Requirements for Evaluation Subfactor (4)

4.4.1.1 Submit a narrative statement about the Offeror's corporate resources and experience with logistics.

4.4.1.2 Explain how the Offeror's resources and experience are expected to contribute to the Offeror's successful completion of the project.